DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 918 HE 021 911

AUTHOR Amos, Arthur K., Jr.
TITLE The Davis Academic Environment. A Report of Student Opinions.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 58p.; For a related document, see HE 021 912.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; College Environment; College Faculty; College Students; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Environment; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Majors (Students); Outcomes of Education; Professional Education; School Policy; School Surveys; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; *Student College Relationship; Student Development; Teacher Attitudes; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students at the University of California-Davis regarding campus strengths and weaknesses are presented. Data collected with a survey mailed to a stratified random sample of 1,565 students are used. Eight sections look at the following: (1) academic major programs (course content in the major, major instruction, and program flexibility); (2) courses and classes (course variety, availability of courses, and class size); (3) faculty (instructor availability and faculty attitudes about students); (4) policies and procedures (testing/grading system, academic probation and suspension policies, and cheating); (5) academic facilities and services (classroom facilities, laboratory facilities, study areas, library facilities and services, computer services, and tutorial services); (6) educational outcomes (intellectual growth, writing ability, and preparation for future occupation); (7) overall evaluation; and (8) conclusions and recommendations. Some of the major findings from the study are as follows: Davis students generally report higher levels of satisfaction with components of the academic environment than those reported by their national counterparts; undergraduates respond positively to questions about their major programs; Davis is already showing early effects of growth and crowding; and most undergraduates report that Davis has made a very large or large contribution to their intellectual growth. An appendix offers responses to individual questions in 22 tables. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE DAVIS ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

A Report of Student Opinions

ED299918

Arthur K. Amos, Jr.

Student Affairs Research and Information

University of California, Davis

May 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Univ of California
Davis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 911

THE DAVIS ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT
A Report of Student Opinion

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines the perceptions of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students at UC Davis. It uses data collected with a survey mailed to a stratified random sample of 1565 students. Of the surveys mailed, 51.2% were returned.

The study identifies the following major findings:

- Davis students generally report higher levels of satisfaction with components of the academic environment than those reported by their national counterparts.

- Survey responses and comments suggest that UC Davis is already showing early effects of growth and crowding. While the problems are not yet severe, they may become so if the campus fails to expand its resources with the expanding student body.

- Undergraduates respond positively to questions about their major programs; they report higher levels of satisfaction than the national norms with major course content, with instruction in the major and with program flexibility. Their comments on majors, however, identify such problems as overcrowding, restricted focus and faculty emphasis on research at the expense of instruction.

- Davis undergraduate respondents report higher levels of satisfaction than their national counterparts with course variety and course availability, but a lower level with class size. Despite relatively high satisfaction with course availability, their comments reveal the pressures of conflicting class times and increasing competition for classes.

- Undergraduates report satisfaction with faculty availability and faculty attitudes similar to national levels. Satisfaction with testing and grading and with academic probation and suspension policies follows the same pattern. They cite cheating as a problem at UC Davis.

- Davis undergraduates report high satisfaction with most academic facilities and services, including classrooms, laboratories, and computing and tutorial services. Although they report a slightly higher level of satisfaction than the national norm with the library facilities and services, their comments suggest difficulties associated with overcrowding. Similar comments about study areas correspond with a level of satisfaction slightly below that reported nationally.

- Most undergraduates report that UC Davis has made a Very Large or Large contribution to their intellectual growth; slightly more than a third report such a contribution to their writing ability; and a majority are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the preparation they are receiving for their future occupations.

- Nine out of ten report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with UC Davis in general and more than three-quarters report that they would definitely or probably come here a second time were they to do it all over again.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Executive Summary i

Introduction 1

Academic Major Programs 3

- Course Content in the Major
- Major Instruction
- Program Flexibility

Courses and Classes 9

- Course Variety
- Availability of Courses
- Class Size

Faculty 13

- Instructor Availability
- Faculty Attitudes about Students

Policies and Procedures 16

- Testing/Grading System
- Academic Probation and Suspension Policies
- Cheating

Academic Facilities and Services 20

- Classroom Facilities
- Laboratory Facilities
- Study Areas
- Library Facilities and Services
- Computer Services
- Tutorial Services

Educational Outcomes 26

- Intellectual Growth
- Writing Ability
- Preparation for Future Occupation

Overall Evaluation 29

Conclusions and Recommendations 31

Appendix A-1

INTRODUCTION

In Spring 1987 Student Affairs Research and Information surveyed students at UC Davis to determine their perceptions of campus strengths and weaknesses. By answering a questionnaire developed by the American College Testing Program (ACT) and a set of campus-specific questions, respondents provided their opinions about a range of campus programs and services, and evaluated various aspects of the college environment. We sent the survey to a sample of UC Davis undergraduate, graduate and professional students; a second mailing to non-respondents followed four weeks later. This report reflects data from a 51.2% response rate overall.

We constructed a sample of 1565 students, disproportionately stratified by ethnicity and level. Ratios of sample to population thus vary by subpopulation and the analysis of the whole population uses weighted values. For responses to questions of satisfaction, we assigned numeric values on a scale from 5 (Very Satisfied) to 1 (Very Dissatisfied). We then multiplied the response values by weighting factors that take into account respondent ethnicity, gender and class level.

This analysis uses means to compare Davis responses with norms derived from a sample of colleges with populations larger than 10,000 students surveyed between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1986. Davis means reported here are, unless otherwise noted, for undergraduate respondents. In particular, mean responses reported for individual ethnic groups are only for undergraduates. These means must, however, be viewed with caution. Weighting of Davis responses and the nature of the response scale render these numbers imprecise when making comparisons with colleges nationally.[1]

This report discusses variables related to the classroom environment and other aspects of academic life at Davis.[2] The body of the report contains summary statistics; the Appendix attached presents tables of the complete responses to relevant questions. As the following analysis shows, Davis students generally report higher levels of satisfaction than their national peers. Nevertheless, respondent satisfaction varies considerably at UC Davis.

---

[1]An appendix further discussing methodology is available upon request.

[2]Respondent attitudes about pre-enrollment, academic and career advising were previously discussed in *Advising at UC Davis: A Report of Student Opinions,* Arthur K. Amos, Jr., Student Affairs Research and Information (March 1988).

In addition to answering specific questions about the classroom environment and other aspects of academic life at UC Davis, many respondents addressed the matter directly in the survey's Comments section. This section asked respondents: " What is your advice [to the new Chancellor] for strengthening UC Davis?" The wording of this instruction may have encouraged respondents to focus their remarks on weaknesses rather than strengths. Even given this probable bias, many of the comments should be interpreted as cautionary, particularly in an era of projected growth.

ACADEMIC MAJOR PROGRAMS

Three questions on the ACT questionnaire deal with feelings about the major program. One asks respondents to report how satisfied they are with "course content in your major field." A second asks about satisfaction with "instruction in your major field." The third asks about satisfaction with the "flexibility to design your own program of study." To all three questions Davis respondents report higher levels of satisfaction than their national counterparts.

In their comments about major programs, however, respondents point to particular problems warranting attention. Such comments represent eddies in the tide of student opinion, not the primary ebbs and flows themselves. To some extent, many concerns raised by respondents may reflect thwarted expectations. Some students do not seem to have anticipated the degree to which UC Davis is a research institution with highly specialized, often highly technical majors. These students are put off by the narrow focus they perceive to be inherent in their majors and by the proportion of faculty attention devoted to research.

Some dissatisfaction may be alleviated by improved communications with students prior to matriculation and by increased emphasis on undergraduate instruction. It may, however, be exacerbated by future efforts to market the campus and by pressures of increased enrollments.

Course Content in the Major

Students report fairly high levels of satisfaction with the course content of their major programs; the mean level of satisfaction reported by undergraduates is higher than the national norms (4.04 *versus* 3.89). Graduate students, however, are generally less likely than undergraduates to report high levels of satisfaction (70.1% Very Satisfied or Satisfied *versus* 83.4%) and much more likely to report low levels (16.1% Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied *versus* 5.7%).

Affirmative Action students (SAA) are generally much less likely to report high levels of satisfaction than non-SAA students, although the distribution of Chicano responses approaches that of non-SAA students. Blacks and a subgroup comprised of American Indians, Latinos, and Filipinos are equally likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (13.4% and 13.2% respectively) but Blacks are slightly more likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (71.5% *versus* 68.3%).

Only one respondent chose to comment specifically on the content of a major program:

> Unfortunately, even within my field of study--Native American Studies--disappointment exists. When I enrolled in the major, I had hoped to receive a viable, accredited, traditional (native) education which could aid my survival and promote skills of traditional education and community development. I am very sad to say that neither my expectations nor my needs as a native have been met by NAS.

This complaint is echoed in a general way by one respondent commenting on majors in Letters and Science:

> I'm not very satisfied with the College of Letters & Science. . . . Davis needs to upgrade their L&S majors. The intellectual level here also doesn't seem very high, I think that reflects the lack of stimulating course material.

Although these two respondents appear to represent minority views, they call attention to the extent to which some students expect their major programs to meet personal and intellectual needs.

The more typical comment focuses not on specific major or college but on what might be called the technical emphasis of the campus. One student wrote pointedly about the constricting effect of that emphasis.

> The continued emphasis on the advance of technology has exacted a high price on the overall college educational experience. UCD produces technicians--probably excellent ones. However, in almost five years of undergraduate and graduate education here, I have seldom been challenged to think critically or integrate the various areas of study in my curriculum. The pressure to perform on exams and produce publishable work is a very dis-integrating experience. Having "survived" UCD requirements, do we now go forward and educate ourselves on the areas of adult life outside our major? We can clone genes but what about the rest?

For another student, the restrictions apply particularly to students in the College of Engineering.

> The only weakness that I see in the curriculum at Davis is the lack of emphasis on humanities and liberal arts. Some majors hardly get any exposure to this area (i.e., engineering).

Clearly, the problem of constriction, although more common to technological fields, is not restricted to them *per se*. It may occur with any major that has many, but narrow, course requirements. Growth in the amounts of material included in major programs that comes as the result of technological or intellectual advances will likely exacerbate this problem.

Several respondents feel that the strengths of their majors are insufficiently credited and publicized. Two majors specifically cited by respondents making this complaint are International Relations and Landscape Architecture. From the students' point of view, this under-attention can lead to insufficient resources allocated to the program and increased competition to get into the program. Comments one respondent:

> More attention should be paid to one of the "top" and most successful undergraduate programs in the nation . . . "The Landscape Architecture program at UCD."
>
> Competition into the major is stiff and the number of applicants increases every year, in this already successful program.
>
> My hope is that UCD begins to recognize its potential in this major and works toward developing it further.

As the campus grows and the resources of crowded programs become stretched, the problems affecting these students are likely to worsen. Increased publicity for those programs, however, may hinder more than help solve the problems.

Major Instruction

Students seem to differentiate course content from course instruction and are slightly less satisfied with the latter. Although they report higher mean levels of satisfaction than their national counterparts (3.95 *versus* 3.84), Davis undergraduates are more likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with course instruction than with course content (7.9% *versus* 5.7%); the opposite is true of graduate and professional students (14.0% *versus* 16.1%).

Blacks report less dissatisfaction with instruction than with content (6.0% Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with instruction in their majors *versus* 13.4% with course content), while Asians report less satisfaction with content than instruction (7.4% *versus* 3.1%). Undergraduates in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences are particularly likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with instruction in the major (11.4%).

These are not overwhelming differences and one must be cautious about drawing inferences from them, especially as the level of satisfaction is generally fairly high. Nevertheless, one can speculate that satisfaction with instruction is related to student perception of the relative weight given by faculty to research and instruction. Among the three colleges, teaching loads are lowest in Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

On two areas connected with the quality of their instruction, both in and out of the major, students are most vociferous: the effect of subordinating instruction (especially undergraduate instruction) to research and the inability of some instructional staff to speak English clearly.

For at least one student, the emphasis on research at Davis seems to have come as a surprise:

> Before I came to UCD, I didn't realize it is a "research" University--Professors should be encouraged and rewarded for their <u>teaching</u> skills.

For many students, the Davis emphasis on research appears to come at the expense of the quality of instruction.

> I think this is a great University and I will always be proud of being a UCD graduate. My only serious criticism of the system, a problem that shows a lot more with younger instructors who are still working on their tenure, is that they seem often more concerned about their research than of the courses they teach. (There are of course many exceptions to this observation.) This attitude often creeps into the course content. . . .

The attitude that at least some faculty short-change teaching for research seems rather widespread and many students resent that emphasis.

> Hire your teaching staff on their abilities to teach--not on how many articles they've published or how exotic a country they come from. Don't take the attitude that students should be able to obtain all the information for themselves. If this is really the case, what do we need instructors for in the first place? Are your professors required to have teaching credentials?

This respondent is alone in mentioning "teaching credentials" as an appropriate criterion for University faculty. But accepting the importance of research to the institution does not, in the eyes of the other respondents, mean accepting shoddy teaching at the same time. As one respondent puts the matter:

> UC Davis is most definitely a research university. This concentration benefits those students who are established in their fields. For the new student, the preoccupation of a majority of professors with their own research presents an obstacle to obtaining valuable non-classroom instruction. The student then faces having to take his/her questions to a TA who may or may not have the time, expertise, or methodology to adequately address the situation.

These remarks appear to reflect a view widely held. Increased emphasis on improving the reputation of Davis as a research university will do little to change this impression and may serve only to confirm it.

The discontent expressed by students unhappy with the sacrifice of teaching for research is less intense than that of those unhappy with instructors who speak English poorly. The following is typical of such complaints:

> I would suggest that the foreign TA's be tested for their command of verbal English. This suggestion is based on the fact that chem labs are difficult enough; without always having to try to translate what the TA announced into comprehensible language. I, too, used to believe this was some idea thought up by disgruntled chem students, but the past year's labs has brought the problem into light. The TAs are competent in chemistry, yet they have a problem expressing ideas.

Student concerns with the linguistic facility of their instructors are not restricted to teaching assistants, although they do receive the brunt of the criticism. The extent of the problem is not entirely clear because some comments, like the following, are based on hearsay:

> I have also heard of many instances in which instructors or TAs cannot speak English well and/or clearly--this is very unsatisfactory--material is hard enough without not being able to understand what the instructor is saying!

Although these matters are far from clear, the college with the highest proportion of non-native faculty, Engineering, has the lowest mean satisfaction with major instruction (3.78), while the one with the smallest proportion, Letters and Science, has the highest (4.01). It is important to note, however, that much more work needs to be done to understand fully the role played by language problems in instruction.

Other concerns mentioned by respondents include a need for more minority and female faculty.

> There is a need for more ethnic diversity among teaching staff; also minority professors need full-time status.

> I would also like to point out that sexism is a major problem on this campus. WE NEED MORE FEMALE PROFESSORS AND TEACHING STAFF and more emphasis on women in literature, in history, in politics, in art, in music, etc.

These comments suggest that respondents believe the instruction of a diverse student body would be enhanced by a sexually and ethnically diverse faculty. A related matter is raised by a respondent noting that differences in teaching methods may have different impacts on different ethnic groups.

> There is a tremendous need for more student/professor interaction along with more in-class discussion. Majority of professors and instructors tend to intimidate students (particularly minority students). Need for more cultural activities to create cultural awareness.

Such opinions will have increasing weight as the demography of the campus changes and as women move into traditionally male-dominated majors. If the needs expressed by these students are genuine, they must be met. Above all, the campus should demonstrate through the quality of its faculty that Blacks need not be taught only by Blacks, Chicanos only by Chicanos, women only by women, and so on.

Finally, several respondents singled out specific departments or programs for praise or censure. Their comments are worth citing because they indicate the strength of student feelings about the quality of instruction at Davis. In spite of, and perhaps because of, high overall evaluations of instruction at Davis, the discontent of a few students stands out. If the growth of the campus leads to a diminution of personal contact between students and faculty and a resulting decline in the quality of instruction, then these negative comments will have served as harbingers of things to come and we will hear fewer positive ones.

> I have found the teachers in the child development masters program to be basically unfit as teachers. Many are disorganized, give poor lectures and it becomes clear very quickly that teaching students comes last on their list of priorities. Because of their poor ability to teach and inspire their students I feel I am getting a very poor education from them. I am at the point of looking into other colleges to see about transferring elsewhere where the teaching of students is given top priority. In order to protect the good teachers I wish to state I have had two--Emmy Werner and George Yonge. Bad teachers were _____ and _____.

> If earning a prestigious reputation among the academic community is the only concern of the administration, then the Division of Statistics is doing a great job. If educating the students of this University is also a concern, then the Division of Statistics is failing. The Division chooses its

instructors not with the students' best interests in mind but how well that instructor will best benefit them. This has been the case for a number of qualified instructors, not just one.

I do not regret making UCD my choice for going to college. I feel though that some of the departments, especially Math and Zoology, are sadly lacking in quality teaching.

I am a first year law student at King Hall. The level of teaching at King Hall is excellent. Professors Rex Perschbacher, Joel Dobris, and Margaret Johns should be personally thanked by the Chancellor for their diligence and abilities. However, there is no excuse for not hiring Cruz Reynoso as a full-time professor.

I am enrolled as a special status student in the School of Medicine as a Nurse Practitioner student. I am very pleased with the instruction I am receiving in this field. The philosophy of the program is family-oriented medicine and this is very compatible with my philosophy of the health-care delivery system. I would definitely choose the UCD program again.

Program Flexibility

Students express general satisfaction with the flexibility available to design their own programs; the mean level of satisfaction for Davis undergraduates is higher than the national norm (3.66 *versus* 3.54). About three-fifths of undergraduates and a similar proportion of graduate and professional students report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with program flexibility.

While there is little variation on this issue by gender, ethnicity, or class level, substantial variation occurs by college. Among respondents from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, 71.0% reported being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with program flexibility and only 5.7% reported being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. Engineers report lower levels of satisfaction: only 38.8% are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with program flexibility and 28.3% say they are Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. Letters and Science students fall between students from the other two colleges on this issue.

COURSES AND CLASSES

The ACT questionnaire includes three questions dealing with "variety of courses offered," "availability of the courses you want at times you want them," and "class size." While these questions address issues that transcend major programs, levels of satisfaction with these areas are likely to be influenced by experiences with the major. Except for class size, Davis undergraduates express higher levels of satisfaction than their national counterparts.

The lower levels of satisfaction with class size expressed by Davis respondents and comments concerning availability of courses and the size of classes are warning signs for the future. If campus growth leads to increased competition for space in limited course offerings or to an increase either in the size of classes overall or in the number of large classes, we may expect increased dissatisfaction with education at UC Davis, particularly among undergraduates.

Course Variety

Students rate themselves generally very satisfied with the variety of courses offered at UC Davis. Undergraduates are somewhat more satisfied than their national counterparts (4.15 *versus* 3.98). Few differences appear among the various subgroups on this issue, save that Blacks and graduate and professional students are particularly likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (13.1% and 12.4%). Among graduate and professional students this dissatisfaction may be driven by the absence or infrequency in offering of particular specialized courses, but the reason for Black dissatisfaction is less clear.

Few students commented on the variety of course offerings, which may indicate generally favorable feelings about the variety of courses offered at the campus. This conclusion is supported by one graduate student whose remarks are positive:

> As a graduate student, I appreciate the opportunities for serving as a teaching assistant in a variety of courses here at UCD, and also the wide range of seminars is helpful.

Availability of Courses

Respondents express less satisfaction with the availability of courses than with their variety. However, this phenomenon is replicated on the national level and Davis undergraduates are more satisfied than their national counterparts (3.27 *versus* 2.95).

Among undergraduates, men are substantially less likely than women to be Very Satisfied or Satisfied (40.5% *versus* 56.0%) but are only slightly more likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (27.1% *versus* 26.0%). This difference carries over to the predominately male student population in Engineering, from which only 36.4% of the respondents report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied *versus* 50.2% for Letters and Science respondents and 50.4% for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

Graduate and professional students are substantially more likely than undergraduates to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (60.3% *versus* 48.6%). These differences would be more significant if graduate and professional students were as reliant upon coursework as undergraduates.

The responses of undergraduate levels form an interesting pattern: freshmen and seniors are most likely to be Very Satisfied or Satisfied (55.6% and 55.3%); satisfaction drops off sharply among sophomores (39.1%) and climbs somewhat for juniors (44.2%). This distribution follows the pattern of assigned priorities used in the registration process wherein seniors have general priority and only freshmen compete for freshman-level courses.

Most of the discontent with the availability of courses, as expressed in the comments, falls into two general areas: difficulty experienced by students in crowded majors in getting into courses in their majors and difficulties arising from having to select from courses offered at the same time.

Most concern expressed by respondents commenting on this issue comes from those who attempted to select courses in crowded majors; the major most often cited in this regard is Design.

> My main areas of concern are within my particular major. Most of the departments on campus seem to be very organized, but the Design Department really needs some work. Perhaps the problems are due to the rapid increase of students in the design major, but the scheduling, number of sections, and variety of courses are insufficient.

The problem is not limited to Design majors; one respondent asks for "More class openings for impacted majors (i.e., Chemistry 129 series)."

A second area of concern focuses on the effect of scheduling the majority of classes between nine in the morning and four in the afternoon. Students report that they are forced to choose between courses offered at the same time.

> I have had trouble with my scheduling due to only one class section offered. For example, there were three classes I wanted to take this quarter that were all offered at the same time.

For some students, restricted scheduling causes different problems; it conflicts with their ability to work and support their families. One respondent was very specific:

> It seems that most of the engineering courses are set for mid-day, and in two years I have only seen two night classes (which were in the Spring of 87). It would be advantageous for married students to have a night program. I feel that the scheduled class times forced me to work nights (12-7) which hurt my GPA. It appears UC Davis is geared for young, single students. A program for married engineering students (or any students) at night would make it easier for a student to hold a day job or a working engineer to keep up with the changing technology.

Course availability and class size (discussed below) are related issues; both are likely to be substantially affected by campus growth, particularly in the short run. If the number of courses and the times that they are offered cannot keep up with increases in demand caused by growth, satisfaction with this aspect of the academic environment will decline. Growth, moreover, may also increase the absolute effect of changes in the popularity of particular academic programs and the campus's ability to respond to such changes.

Class Size

Although a majority of undergraduates are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with size of their classes (64.7%), their mean level of satisfaction is somewhat lower than the national norms (3.59 *versus* 3.82). In addition, there is substantial variation of the satisfaction in the various subgroups.

American Indians, Latinos and Filipinos are least likely by a substantial margin to say that they are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the size of their classes (49.5%); graduate and professional students are most likely (74.8%). The results for the latter group are not particularly surprising as graduate classes are generally small and intimate. The explanation for the former group, however, is not immediately evident. It may reflect differences by ethnicity in learning styles or their feeling more isolated in larger classes.

Unexpectedly, freshmen, who presumably enroll in very large classes more often than other undergraduates, are least likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with class size (9.7%). This finding may imply that satisfaction with class size depends on the nature of the course content and the quality of the instruction. Thus, for example, an upper division class in literature of 60 students might lead to more dissatisfaction than a freshman class in chemistry of more than 300. This finding may also suggest differences in expectations about class sizes at various levels of undergraduate education.

The tenor of the comments on the size of classes is consistent; respondents want smaller classes. Some comments, like the two following, focus on class size in particular areas.

> Core engineering classes are large. Subsequently professors do not give adequate time to the courses or their students.

> I have been in ethnic study classes where the rooms were too small. In one class there were

70 students enrolled and only 50 seats. This not only creates a fire hazard but also creates an uncomfortable learning environment.

The last comment calls attention to a related problem: over-enrolling of certain courses in anticipation of post-registration drops. Some students register for a heavier courseload than they plan to complete, dropping unattractive courses long after the beginning of the term. Anticipating this, course planners assign courses to rooms that will hold their expected final size even though the classroom will have too few seats for the initial enrollment. Of course, this practice makes the class less attractive, encouraging drops and the practice of over-registration by students. This problem is likely to worsen as the campus becomes more crowded and competition for classes increases.

Most of the comments, however, address the problem of large classes at UC Davis in general. The two following represent a large number of similar comments.

Decrease class size, we shouldn't need speakers and microphones to hear our professors.

Class size (student-to-teacher ratio) is too large. Teachers do not have enough involvement/ interaction with the students. Offer more sections of classes.

Much of the concern expressed by students commenting on class size has to do with the teacher-student relationship. Respondents commenting on this matter argue that large class size inhibits good working relationships with their teachers. This attitude may also influence the degree of satisfaction with teaching discussed above.

For at least one respondent the large classes are symptomatic of problems arising from the growth of the campus:

One major issue that I would like to comment [on] is the over-crowded classrooms. There are problems in the number and selection of courses in my major, but that is the problem of the Engineering Department. The overcrowded classroom is a large problem for the University. The enrollment is increasing. The selection of better students or "qualified" students is decreasing to my observations. The over-enrollment of students with little expansion in the University creates problems for serious students who want the most out of their education. I had to drop several critical classes and had to take classes at undesirable times because the classroom was not large enough to accommodate all the students, yet it was the only section offered. Out of 50 students about 25 had to drop. This is ridiculous. The Union Square, the UCD Bookstore, the Coffee House, you name it; it's too damn crowded. Either expand the University in those crowded areas or stop taking every single applicant to the University. The choice is yours, but many students like myself are getting more frustrated each year. We want to see improvements not deterioration.

FACULTY

Two questions on the ACT questionnaire center on faculty responsiveness to students. One asks about satisfaction with "out-of-class availability of your instructors" and the other asks about satisfaction with the "attitude of the faculty toward students." In both cases, Davis undergraduates report levels of satisfaction similar to those reported nationally. And in both cases, most Davis students report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied. In this context, the negative comments about faculty attitudes seem somewhat shrill and atypical. Even so, an institution bent on self-improvement will do well to heed the complaints of even a small minority.

Instructor Availability

Undergraduates are only slightly more positive about the out-of-class availability of instructors than their national counterparts (3.84 *versus* 3.75). Graduate and professional students are more likely to report being Very Satisfied than undergraduates (29.2% *versus* 17.4%); undergraduates are more likely to report being Satisfied (56.4% *versus* 47.9%).

Blacks and Asians are especially unlikely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with the availability of instructors (2.3% and 1.8%). Conversely, American Indians, Chicanos, Filipinos and Latinos are most likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (9.7% for Chicanos and 9.6% for the other non-Black Affirmative Action students). The cause of these differences is not apparent, although they may reflect differing levels of preferred contact with faculty.

Growth of the campus, especially if it causes an increase in the student-faculty ratio, may put the relatively high level of satisfaction in jeopardy. Increased demand on faculty time will reduce the quantity, if not the quality, of faculty time available to each individual student. Moreover, as the hours of instruction increase into the early morning, late afternoon and evening, changes in faculty schedules will have the net effect of reducing out-of-class contact time for some students.

Faculty Attitudes about Students

As is the case with most aspects of the academic experience at UC Davis touched on by this survey, undergraduates are positive about faculty attitudes about students. Three-quarters of respondents (74.8%) report that they are Very Satisfied or Satisfied and only 7.7% Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. The mean level of satisfaction reported by Davis respondents is very close to the national norm (3.82 *versus* 3.81).

There are some differences by gender. Although undergraduate men and women almost equally report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (7.5% and 7.9%), women more frequently report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (77.0% *versus* 72.5%). Because this is a question for which sexual harassment should contribute to student perceptions, these results may imply that respondents perceive a relatively low level of sexual harassment of women students by male faculty.

As students progress through their careers, they become increasingly likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with faculty attitudes: freshmen, 5.6%; sophomores, 6.6%; juniors, 6.8%; seniors, 10.6%; and graduate and professional students, 12.1%. This phenomenon probably occurs because, as a student's career becomes longer, the chances of having a bad experience with a faculty member increase.

This pattern cannot explain the high incidence among either Black (11.2%) or American Indian, Filipino, and Latino (12.0%) students who report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with faculty attitudes. These two groups, moreover, are least likely of any to report being Very Satisfied with faculty attitudes (7.3% and 7.1% respectively). These levels of satisfaction may be tied to perceptions of institutional racism by students from these ethnic groups.

Students from all three undergraduate colleges are about equally likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with faculty attitudes: Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, 70.7%; Engineering, 71.2%; and Letters and Science, 72.5%. But there are differences as well. Students from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences are particularly unlikely to be Neutral (6.8%) and most likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (12.5%). Letters and Science students are the next most likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (6.4%), while Engineering students are least likely (1.7%).

A number of students chose to comment on faculty attitudes and most who did are, for one reason or another, unhappy.

> Unfortunately most of the teachers here could care less about their students. They are only here to do their research and pick up a paycheck. _____ is a perfect example of such a teacher. He has an inability to communicate with the students and couldn't give a damn about improving. He and many other teachers seem to want revenge against students for taking "their time."
>
> I believe the faculty need to realize they are here for the students, because without us there would be no school. We are not just a number which can be replaced if we flunk out. We are the future

of this country and world; students should be educated not just pushed through the system to keep our dollars coming in to support the University system. (Education is #1).

This generalized vehemence, tarring most faculty with the same brush, was somewhat unusual; most respondents acknowledge variety among the faculty.

As with any college, there are some instructors here who are The Pits!! The quality of teaching here is not much better than my high school. I have teachers that (1) degrade students (2) don't know how to teach (3) don't know their material (4) who are very unorganized. The "Egoist teachers"who do not respect/acknowledge the students are the real problem.

For some unhappy respondents the problem of faculty attitudes is affected by who holds those attitudes. These students observe a predominantly White male faculty and wish for more minorities and women. While the following may be stated somewhat more strongly than is typical, the attitude is a shared one.

I have important things to say. Listen! I am in graduate school and also did my Undergrad work here. I found my education limited--being taught by white men about white men. I think Davis needs to develop diversity--of students, of those in power. My department (English) is especially terrible. Sexism is a horrendous problem at UCD--sexist comments in classrooms, little attention given to minority/women writers, small amount of women in the department with tenure. I am concerned with the lack of integrity and education at UCD, teachers who care about living/changing their world passionately enough. Those who do, fall under scrutiny/restrictions from powers above. See Merline Williams in American Studies!

The levels of satisfaction reported prove that most respondents are happy with faculty; one comment represents the happier majority:

Generally, my experiences at UC Davis have been very positive. Most of my instructors have been caring, considerate, and encouraging. I found students and the atmosphere in general to be friendly. I would recommend this institution to anyone who is willing to work hard to accomplish his/her goals.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The questionnaire included three questions about academic policies and procedures, one of which was devised by the campus for UC Davis students. The two ACT questions ask about satisfaction with the "testing/grading system" and with "academic probation and suspension policies." Davis respondents report levels of satisfaction to these two questions comparable to those reported in the national norms; Davis respondents report slightly lower levels of satisfaction with testing and grading and somewhat higher with probation and suspension policies. The third question, developed by the campus, asked students to rate how much of a problem "cheating" was for UC Davis students. In their comments on all of these issues, respondents address some serious concerns that deserve increasing attention as the campus grows.

Testing/Grading System

The mean level of satisfaction of undergraduates with testing and grading, while positive, ranks slightly below the national norm (3.56 *versus* 3.63). Although respondents indicate relative satisfaction with the methods of testing and grading at UC Davis, there is considerable variation among the various subgroups.

Fewer graduate students than undergraduates say that they are Very Satisfied or Satisfied (60.0% *versus* 68.6%) and slightly more report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. These differences follow a trend established at the undergraduate level: the more advanced their academic career, the less likely students will be Very Satisfied or Satisfied and the more likely they will be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. This pattern suggests that students enter postsecondary education prepared to be satisfied with testing and grading but, as they progress in their careers, they become more likely to encounter testing or grading practices that change their attitudes.

There are also differences among ethnic groups: Asians generally indicate higher levels of satisfaction than other groups and Blacks generally indicate lower levels of satisfaction. Of those in the middle, White and other non-SAA students are least likely to be Neutral about testing and grading and most likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied.

Many respondents chose to comment on a variety of aspects of testing and grading at UC Davis. Several, such as the following, spoke to present problems and the need for consistency in grading practices.

> Please find a grading system which is fair to both science and English students. Also, try to develop some consistency in grading among instructors of all areas.

Other students would resist standardization if it meant increased reliance on multiple choice exams and grading on a curve.

> Evaluate the testing system more closely. I feel that there is too much emphasis placed on multiple choice testing. This form of testing does not reflect how much a student has learned and is geared toward people who naturally take exams well.

> Classes that were not graded on a curve were particularly interesting to me. I only had myself to compete with. The classes I learned the most in were those that encouraged group projects and co-operation among students.

Others, including one medical student, argue that multiple choice exams encourage, at best, regurgitation and, at worst, cheating.

> Also too much emphasis is based on grades [in Vet School], more should be based on the ability to apply knowledge and not the ability to regurgitate meaningless trivia.

> The honor system is not working at the medical school. Although this is a problem of the students' characters, the objective grading system contributes to it.

One student with college experience abroad suggests that essay exams are superior to multiple choice exams even in the sciences:

> After attending a British University, I must say that our University System only encourages short-term knowledge for exams, with not enough emphasis on writing. As a Chemistry student there I had to write essays, not simply plug numbers into equations. This obviously required more thought and caused me to understand the subject much better. There needs to be some sort of in-depth exam or something so that when you get out of here you have a body of knowledge and not just a degree saying you took a few classes.

Unfortunately for students who feel as these do, the future is likely to bring more, not fewer, standardized tests and courses graded on a curve. Increases in class size resulting from expansion of the campus makes standardized tests more attractive to faculty because they can be graded by computers.

Academic Probation and Suspension Policies

Asked to express their satisfaction with academic probation and suspension policies, most respondents (87.8%) reported that they were Satisfied or Neutral, with responses slightly more frequent in the Satisfied category than Neutral category.

Among the several ethnic groups, Asians and Blacks are the most likely to be Very Satisfied (11.3% and 10.3%) and Blacks are most likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (10.4%). No Asians, on the other hand, reported being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied.

Within the colleges, Engineers are most likely to be Very Satisfied and least likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (14.4% and 1.5%). Students from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, on the other hand, are most likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied and least likely to be Very Satisfied (8.3% and 1.6%).

Although almost 30% of the respondents chose not to answer this question, it is unlikely that all of the remainder have had direct personal experience with the academic probation policies; therefore, not too much weight should be attached to these patterns of responses. On the other hand, those who commented directly on the policies concerning academic probation and dismissal likely have had direct experience with them.

> Help [is] needed for those on AP (academic probation) as a result of academic stress or personal problems.

> Allow students on academic probation to file P/NP--this is grossly UNFAIR!

> I'll never understand why, when on academic probation, we have to wait a year before returning to Davis.

> I have been placed on academic probation after a prolonged and severe illness. No inquiry was ever made as to why I had accumulated incomplete units.

Academic probation and suspension are not experiences with which one normally or easily associates degrees of satisfaction. It would be better to ask if the policies are fairly applied and whether the institution takes appropriate action to assist those who are affected by them. Looked at in this light, the last comment is particularly germane. Students on academic probation may either get deeper into academic difficulty or recover and go on to graduate. These are the students for whom personal contact and direct intervention may have the most benefit. It is particularly important that they not become casualties of expansion, lost for want of sufficient staff to assist them through their troubles.

Cheating

When asked in a campus-developed question if cheating was a problem at UC Davis--using a four-part scale from Not a Problem to Serious Problem-- most respondents (69.6% of undergraduates and post-baccalaureates) report either Not a Problem or Minor Problem. Concern about cheating, however, increases with class level, with seniors and postbaccalaureate respondents more likely than freshmen to identify cheating as a Moderate or Serious Problem by a substantial margin. It is not clear, however, whether this finding represents an increased awareness of cheating or a change in attitude about cheating.

Several respondents chose in their comments to address the issue of cheating. The following

comments from a freshman are representative of those from undergraduates.

> Although I have only attended Davis for a short time, I have learned much about myself and others. I have grown intellectually, and am confident that this will continue throughout my career here. I have noticed, however, that we have a serious problem of cheating. A more intensive test monitoring program needs to be implemented in order to resolve this problem.

The comments of postbaccalaureate respondents make clear that their responses are influenced by their experiences in undergraduate classrooms as Teaching Assistants--but only in part. The following is reflective of the Teaching Assistants' comments.

> As a teaching assistant in chemistry, one area that I feel needs attention is the disciplining of students if/when they are caught cheating. I have caught several students cheating on exams, and some instructors I know have xeroxed exams of suspect students before returning them, and some of their students have returned with parts of their exams altered, claiming that they were mis-graded. The usual punishment in these cases ranges from mere scolding to failure in that class--not nearly severe enough. These students should be expelled, but as one instructor told me, "the administration does not accept xeroxed exams as proof." Also, I think overall grading of students (in Chemistry) is too lax--there seems to be a fear of giving 'Fs'.

Clearly cheating is a serious problem. Not clear, however, is whether it is more or less of a problem at Davis than elsewhere in the country because this was a campus-specific question. In any case, a number of factors have a bearing on the problem: large class sizes, reliance on objective exams, and what one respondent referred to in another context as students' "ultimate concerns . . . in maximizing the GPA."

ACADEMIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The questionnaire included several questions about specific facilities and services. Among these, respondents were asked to express their use of and satisfaction with "classroom facilities, "laboratory facilities," "study areas," "library facilities and services," "computing services" and "college-sponsored tutorial services." Barring expansion of the physical plant, satisfaction in these areas is particularly likely to be affected by increases in the student body.

In responding to questions about satisfaction with classrooms and laboratories, Davis students follow national patterns. Apart from comments about overcrowded classes discussed above, these respondents give little evidence that campus growth has contributed to a decline in satisfaction with classroom and laboratory facilities.

The same is not true of the responses regarding study areas and library facilities. Although Davis respondents report about the same levels of satisfaction with study areas and the library as their national counterparts, the comments indicate that the effects of expansion are already being felt.

The responses to the questions about computing and tutorial services show Davis students to be somewhat more satisfied than their national counterparts. While the comments suggest a few dark clouds on the sunny horizons of these services, the general tenor is that the campus must continue them at current levels, even as it grows.

Classroom Facilities

Almost three-quarters of the respondents (73.8%) reported being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with classroom facilities; excluding Blacks and Engineers, the preponderance of other responses fall in the Neutral category. This pattern is comparable to that found in the national norms.

Blacks are most likely among undergraduate subgroups to report being Very Satisfied with classroom facilities (16.9%); they are also the most likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (13.1%). Engineers, though less extreme, also report stronger satisfaction levels than other undergraduates, with 15.8% being Very Satisfied and 11.6% Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied.

Despite generally high levels of satisfaction with classroom facilities, several students ex-

pressed dissatisfaction with lighting and ventilation. Typical of such complaints is the following, one hopes hyperbolic, comment:

> Every room that I've had classes in during the past 3 years has needed work on heating, air conditioning and/or lighting (overall improvement in "O&M" of classrooms needed).

And one student requested more desks for left-handed students:

> Please supply left-handed desks in all classes. The % of lefties is very high and I appreciate the rooms that have them, but we need more lefty desks especially for ENL classes.

The paucity of comments about classroom facilities suggests at least the absence of strong dissatisfaction with the facilities.

Laboratory Facilities

Undergraduate respondents report moderate satisfaction with laboratory facilities at UC Davis; the mean level of satisfaction reported is comparable with the national norm (3.68 *versus* 3.64).

Slightly more than two-thirds (68.1%) of undergraduates report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the laboratory facilities at UC Davis. A similar proportion of graduate and professional students report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (68.0%), but they are more likely than undergraduates to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with laboratory facilities (15.2% *versus* 9.2%).

Among the ethnic groups, Asians are particularly likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (83.8%), while none report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. Whites and other non-SAA students, on the other hand, are least likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied and most likely to be Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (63.0% and 11.8%). The response patterns of Affirmative Action students tend to fall between those of the two groups of non-SAA students.

Respondents who chose to comment on laboratory facilities expressed some dissatisfaction. These comments come from a senior (the first one below) and two graduate students.

> Lab facilities--often not enough equipment. (Where do all these funds go?)

> Lab space is a big problem. Many graduate students are not provided with adequate space and environment to study and to do research.

> Science and engineering labs are antiquated.

As is true of the responses about classrooms, these responses suggest that, despite room for improvement, Davis students are satisfied with the quality of the physical plant devoted to instruction.

Study Areas

Asked about their use of and satisfaction with study areas, almost two- thirds of undergraduates (65.0%) report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied. Slightly more than one-sixth (17.4%) are Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied. These patterns are similar to those found in the national norms; the mean level of satisfaction reported by Davis undergraduates is likewise similar to that found nationally (3.58 *versus* 3.61).

Relative satisfaction with study areas decreases with increase in student levels: freshmen are the most satisfied (79.4% report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied), sophomores next (74.2%), juniors next (61.8%), seniors next (53.3%), and graduate and professional students last (51.1%). Some decline in satisfaction may be attributed to the residence halls being good places to study for freshmen, but more must be attributed to the necessity for good study areas that grows as a student's career progresses.

Students commenting on study space indicate the presence of problems that will worsen as the campus grows. Not too surprisingly, they focus on space in the libraries:

> The only suggestion I could make at this point has to do with my dissatisfaction with the study areas. The study areas I have visited--in the dormitories as well as in the libraries--are usually overcrowded. Overcrowding of study areas results in noisy places, in which it is very difficult to concentrate. Another problem with these study areas is the inappropriate high temperature that these areas maintain, especially during Spring Quarter (I could extend this problem to the lecture halls).

> [T]he on-campus study facilities should be improved and expanded. I love to study on campus but often the libraries are full or they are not well-lighted and uncomfortable.

> Since UCD has such an academically competitive atmosphere, I think it is important to make study facilities (i.e., the campus library) comfortable. In comparison to the UCSB library, our libraries are terrible--we need carpeting and comfortable chairs, more room without book stacks surrounding us. . . . I study hard, but am often uncomfortable due to the facility condition and competitive atmosphere and I think many others feel the same way.

The issues raised by these students suggest that campus expansion will absolutely increase the need for available study space. This problem will be exacerbated by expansion of classroom hours, which will further reduce space currently available for study during the late afternoon and early evenings.

Library Facilities and Services

Respondents are fairly positive about library facilities and services, with little difference between graduates and undergraduates. Over four- fifths of the undergraduates (83.4%) report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with library facilities and services; their mean level of satisfaction is slightly higher than that reported in the national norms (4.09 *versus* 3.96). Graduate students are, however, much more likely than undergraduates to be Very Dissatisfied (3.5% *versus* 0.3%).

There are also differences by college among undergraduates, with Letters and Science students being the least satisfied and Engineering students the most satisfied. Indeed, 11.4% of the Letters and Science students report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with library services and facilities, while no Engineers rated them in either category.

White students are generally less satisfied with the library services and facilities than other undergraduates. Of White respondents, 10.6% express dissatisfaction; Blacks are the next least satisfied, with 4.7% indicating dissatisfaction. The least dissatisfied group are the Asians (1.3% Dissatisfied and none Very Dissatisfied); most satisfied are the Chicanos with 43.0% Very Satisfied and 42.6% Satisfied.

The variation in levels of satisfaction suggests that, as expectation and need increase, satisfaction with library facilities and services decreases. The satisfaction reported by undergraduate classes supports this inference: seniors are most likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (11.6%), while sophomores are most likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (91.9%).

A substantial proportion of the comments dealing with library facilities and services concern the physical plant. At the heart of these concerns is a sense that the library ought to be a good place to study.

> Turn up the heat in the library! It's so cold that it looks like it's trying to deep freeze the books.
>
> More light is needed in the library--it's too dim in there.
>
> I am not satisfied with Shields Library because it is too loud and noisy.
>
> The physical sciences library is claustrophobic and ill-arranged.

Presumably some of these concerns will be alleviated by the expansion of Shields Library. It is unlikely, however, that the expansion will relieve increasing pressures on satellite libraries.

Some of the concern with the library has to do with procedures and policies. Judging from the comments of the respondents, some of the practices of the library should be reviewed and perhaps revised.

> Periodicals should be allowed out of the library for more than 4 hours at a time.
>
> An effort should be made to increase the efficiency of book-retrieval by the libraries. The current recall system is very frustrating and it should be possible to speed that up, perhaps by a campaign to make people aware of the fact that they can give permission to the library to tell others if they have a certain book.
>
> Shields Library regularly sends out $30 invoices for books which they have misplaced, or which were simply deposited after hours. After having been forced to pay five dollars for a book I had returned several days before it was due, I now require Shields Library to give me a receipt for every book I return--even though it's annoying.
>
> OPEN the Med School Library on Friday and Saturday nights.

Problems with library procedures may increase with campus growth and larger volume of business.

One student remarked about the incidence of crime in the library:

> The UC police department should release more information (e.g., through the Aggie) for public awareness (e.g., rape incidences, thefts [particularly wallets] in library). I work at Shields and nothing was ever said.

While students at all levels chose to talk about the libraries as places to study, comments about the quality of the libraries' holdings come primarily from seniors and graduate and professional students. Despite high national rankings for UC Davis library facilities, these respondents commented negatively on the quality of the library's holdings.

> Shields Library is a disgrace. Most of the volumes are archaic and useless.

> Shields Library is too small. There is not a large enough selection of books and periodicals. Although my major is engineering, music is my hobby and I find most of the information I would like is at Berkeley.

> Shields Library services should be updated. Books and journals are often permanently missing. There is a high proportion of out-of-date books.

Finally, one junior confessed an inability to use the library effectively was a hindrance.

> I think that all freshmen should be required to take a course in how to use the library. It was not until my Junior year that I learned how to find a book by myself.

Although one would like to believe such training necessary for college students, this respondent's recommendation is probably sound.

Computer Services

If level of use is any indicator, Davis students are surely becoming computer literate. About half the undergraduates (50.4%) report using computer services, a slightly greater percentage than reported in the national norms (46.8%). In addition, respondents report somewhat more satisfaction with computer services than their national counterparts (3.97 *versus* 3.61). There are, however, large differences among the various subgroups who make up the respondents to this survey as to usage of computer services.

Undergraduate and postbaccalaureate men are much more likely than their female counterparts to report having used computer services (64.2% *versus* 44.1%), and graduate students more likely than undergraduates (64.2% *versus* 50.4%). Letters and Science students are less likely than Agricultural and Environmental Sciences students to have used computer services (41.5% and 49.3%), while almost all Engineering students report having used computer services.

Increased frequency of use does not, when respondents are analyzed by gender and college, lead to increased levels of satisfaction. Thus Engineers are most likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with computer services, while Letters and Science students are least likely to so report (11.9% *versus* 5.5%). Is this another case of familiarity leading to contempt?

Several respondents express pleasure about the availability of microcomputers, especially Apple MacIntoshes.

> [O]ne of the best features of this campus is the comparatively large number of microcomputers available for student use. Computer services programs should be maintained and given further increases in funding.

> In terms of the computer services, i.e., the MacIntoshes, they're great!! We need more of them and more laser printers. These computer services appear to be one of the faster growing areas on campus.

Not all respondents are so happy, however; several express dissatisfaction either with computer services in general or with some specific policy.

> My biggest disappointment in Davis has been the lack of computer facilities comparable to other four-year colleges, and the lack of adequate library facilities.

> Campus computer services should have lower night rates. I often work to 3 or 4 a.m. and there are rarely any other users, but I still get charged at a high rate.

Tutorial Services

Although only slightly more than a quarter of undergraduate respondents report having used tutorial services (28.2% *versus* 16.6% nationally), users report a fairly high level of satisfaction with those services (4.03 *versus* 3.65 in the national norms). Usage varies by level, college and ethnicity. Not surprisingly, more freshmen than students at any other level report having used tutoring services. Differences by college are not large but Engineering students are most likely and students from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences least likely to report having used tutorial services

The variation in usage by ethnicity is striking: in general Affirmative Action students are much more likely to report having used tutorial services than non-SAA students; Blacks report the heaviest usage (84.9%) while Whites report the lowest usage (18.0%). These differences are to be expected, granted the methods on the campus of delivering tutorial services. Less expected, however, is the relatively high usage rate reported by Asians (40.6%).

Regarding satisfaction, there is, with one exception, not much to distinguish the various subgroups. The exception is juniors; they are more likely than any other subgroup to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied with tutorial services (13.8%). Looking at undergraduates by level, juniors are followed in dissatisfaction by seniors (7.5%), sophomores (5.2%) and freshmen (1.3%). This pattern suggests the possibility that transfer students in need of tutorial services receive less help than they wish; however, only one student called for improved or increased tutorial services.

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Several questions dealt with what might be called outcomes of the academic process. Two of the campus-developed questions ask respondents to evaluate UC Davis's contribution to their "intellectual growth (understanding and using concepts, reasoning and critical thinking abilities)" and "writing ability (clear, concise, correct and effective communication)." In addition, an ACT question asked them to rate their satisfaction with the "preparation you are receiving for your future occupation."

Intellectual Growth

When asked how much UC Davis contributed to their intellectual growth, freshmen, not surprisingly, are least likely to say Large or Very Large (47.2%). Seniors are most likely to say that the contribution was Large or Very Large (75.6%); they are followed almost immediately by sophomores (74.1%). While juniors are much more likely than freshmen to report Large or Very Large contribution (68.2% *versus* 47.2%), they are well behind sophomores and seniors. These data suggest the largest contribution to intellectual growth is made in the year immediately following matriculation, although the presence of transfer students in the respondent population may influence the junior ratings also.

Among the ethnic groups, Blacks and Asians are least likely to credit UC Davis with making a Large or Very Large contribution to their intellectual growth (56.1% and 51.4%). Asian students may regard themselves as fairly well advanced intellectually when arriving at UC Davis and so do not perceive the University as contributing to as large a proportion of their intellectual growth as do other students.

Within the undergraduate colleges, students from Engineering are most likely to say that UC Davis made a Large or Very Large contribution to their intellectual growth (80.6%). By comparison, those from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and from Letters and Science (67.6% and 65.4% respectively) are considerably less likely to agree.

Writing Ability

About one-fourth of undergraduate respondents report that the contribution of UC Davis to their writing ability was None or Small (26.4%); slightly more than one-third call it Moderate (35.6%); and still more (38.0%) Large or Very Large.

Distributions of male and female undergraduate responses to this item are very similar. Slightly more than a quarter of both men and women report None or Small contribution (25.4% and 27.2%). The proportions reporting a Moderate contribution are 33.9% and 37.2% respectively. Reporting a Large or Very Large contribution are 40.7% of the men and 37.6% of the women.

On this issue, ethnic groups differ substantially. Blacks and Asians are particularly likely to report a Large or Very Large contribution (47.0% and 50.3%), while Chicanos and Whites are rather unlikely (34.2% and 34.7%).

Preparation for Future Occupation

A majority of undergraduates say that they are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with their preparation for future occupations (57.8%); but an even higher proportion of graduate and professional students so report (70.3%).

There is considerable variation on this issue among ethnic groups. Chicanos are most likely (at levels comparable to graduate and professional students) to report high levels of satisfaction (71.6% *versus* 54.8% for Blacks and 44.5% for American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos). American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos are most likely to report being Neutral on this issue (36.0% *versus* 30.1% for Blacks and 17.4% for Chicanos) as well as being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (19.4% *versus* 15.1% for Blacks and 10.9% for Chicanos).

Among the respondents from the undergraduate colleges, Engineers are the most likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (70.4% *versus* 61.8% for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and 52.7% for Letters and Science). This level of satisfaction stands in marked contrast with the relative dissatisfaction with program flexibility in Engineering.

Although students are generally satisfied with the quality of the preparation for future occupations provided by UC Davis, many of the comments show concern about a lack of breadth in their education.

> UC Davis has an incredible amount to offer students of law, medicine and engineering. Students in these programs are almost guaranteed good jobs upon graduation. Good internships as well as facilities are available to these students. However, students of humanities and particularly the arts are much less fortunate. The job availability is much less frequent and internships in the performance or performance production field are almost non-existent. I would like to see more consideration for and opportunities given to students who write or perform, such as lists of auditions for productions and more University rapport with production companies (i.e., record, radio, booking agencies) to introduce students to the

business world of the arts. The Music Department at UCD could benefit from this.

I believe the undergraduate program is in real danger in that it is not attuned to the average student who does not go on to professional school or to pursue advanced degrees. So often the question arises--"What can I do with a _____ degree?" I think more and more we'll see students shying away from the humanities and less job-oriented science majors because these backgrounds prove virtually worthless on the job market.

I would suggest bolstering the breadth requirements so that students can still choose a field of study that is less vocationally inclined, and yet feel as if their education will carry them far. The writing abilities and general education of many students are very lacking.

This concern applies especially to students in technical fields.

The engineering program is largely based on theory, more practical experience would make the program well rounded. The engineering department could try harder to arrange paid coops or six-month internships. Units could be given for the practical knowledge gained and the student will be financially aided. The student also sees the job market and what companies are like.

Specifically, in my major I would like to see the program made into 5 years for BS--so that engineers could get more exposure to other things (art, language, etc.), additionally I would like to see more practical courses with experienced teachers to help me at the job when I get out of here; rather than teaching so much theory, I mean.

For one student, however, the problem lies less in the University than in the students themselves.

Academically, UCD is first class. Many Davis students, however, are much too self-oriented. It distresses me that so many bright young men and women have so little concern for others and the world around them. Davis needs to emphasize balance; that is to say, less focus on straight intellectual growth, and more on developing character in combination with intellect. Practically speaking, if one is not aware of what is happening around him, and is unable to adequately interact with people, his chances of succeeding in the job market are limited.

OVERALL EVALUATION

The questionnaire included three questions designed to measure overall satisfaction with the UC Davis educational experience. Two of these, asking about satisfaction with the campus in general, essentially duplicate one another and so only one will be reported on here. The third asked: "would you still choose to attend UC Davis if you could start over again?" The responses to these questions are quite encouraging.

Nine out of ten undergraduates report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with UC Davis. Although most students in the national norms report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied, the proportion of Davis undergraduates so reporting is substantially higher (90.3% *versus* 82.6%). The overall level of satisfaction reported by Davis undergraduates is higher than that reported by their national counterparts (4.23 *versus* 3.99).

Among ethnic groups, Black dissatisfaction stands out: Blacks report substantially lower levels of satisfaction with UC Davis than other undergraduates. Only 9.8% of Black respondents report being Very Satisfied; the next smallest proportion reporting being Very Satisfied is for Asians (27.1%). Among all Affirmative Action respondents, Chicanos are most likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (91.7% *versus* 89.3% for American Indians, Latinos and Filipinos and 80.5% for Blacks) and least likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (2.6% *versus* 5.1% for the other Affirmative Action respondents).

Undergraduates report different levels of satisfaction with UC Davis by class level. Freshmen are most likely to report being Very Dissatisfied (3.4% *versus* 0% for sophomores and juniors and 1.8% for seniors), while sophomores are least likely to report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (0.4% *versus* 4.0%, 2.9% and 3.2% for freshmen, juniors and seniors, respectively). Perhaps a substantial proportion of dissatisfied freshmen transfer to another campus or university after their freshman year.

Asked whether they would select UC Davis a second time, more than three-quarters of the undergraduates (78.4%) responded Definitely Yes or Probably Yes; only one in ten (10.2%) reported Probably Not or Definitely Not.

Among Affirmative Action respondents, however, only Chicanos have a response pattern similar to that of all undergraduates. Blacks are less likely to report that they would Definitely or

Probably select UC Davis a second time (48.0% *versus* 72.4% for American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos and 78.4% for Chicanos). Among other respondents, Asians are not as likely to report that they Definitely or Probably would select UC Davis a second time as Whites (72.7% *versus* 82.0%); they are more likely than other non-SAA respondents to report that they would Probably or Definitely Not elect to come to UC Davis if choosing again (18.6% *versus* 7.7%).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The respondents to this survey have, generally speaking, a positive message to the campus about the academic environment. For the most part, Davis students report higher levels of satisfaction than do their national counterparts. Students are, of course, more satisfied with some aspects of UC Davis than others, but Davis shares the valleys with other institutions of comparable size.

These data do not justify complacency. In particular, the comments made by the respondent suggest that the campus is already feeling the impact of growth. It is going to be increasingly difficult, and probably increasingly important, to at least maintain current levels of service in the academic environment. Attention must be paid to the causes and remedies of lower underlying levels of satisfaction among certain ethnic groups, Blacks and Asians in particular.

APPENDIX

RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

The following tables report the responses to individual questions dealing with the academic environment and related aspects of academic life at UC Davis. These tables use weighted data so that individual responses are assigned a weight corresponding to the individual's representedness in the UC Davis student population by ethnicity, gender, and class level.

Tables

Table A-1	Course Content in Major Field
Table A-2	Instruction in Major Field
Table A-3	Flexibility to Design Own Program
Table A-4	Variety of Courses Offered
Table A-5	Availability of Courses Wanted at Times Preferred
Table A-6	Class Size Relative to the Type of Course
Table A-7	Out-of-Class Availability of Instructors
Table A-8	Attitude of Faculty Toward Students
Table A-9	Testing/Grading System
Table A-10	Academic Probation and Suspension Policies
Table A-11	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Cheating?
Table A-12	Classroom Facilities
Table A-13	Laboratory Facilities
Table A-14	Study Areas
Table A-15	Library Facilities and Services
Table A-16	Computer Services
Table A-17	College-Sponsored Tutorial Services
Table A-18	Extent UC Davis Contributed to Your Intellectual Growth
Table A-19	Extent UC Davis Contributed to Your Writing Ability
Table A-20	Preparation Received for Future Occupation
Table A-21	Satisfaction with UC Davis in General
Table A-22	Still Attend UC Davis if You Could Start All Over Again?

TABLE A-1

COURSE CONTENT IN MAJOR FIELD

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	25.6%	54.3%	11.7%	7.3%	1.2%	3.96
Men	23.2	55.6	13.1	7.0	1.0	3.93
Women	27.9	53.2	10.3	7.3	1.3	3.99
Graduate/Professional	20.1	50.0	13.8	14.1	2.0	3.72
Undergraduates:						
All	27.6	55.8	10.9	4.8	0.9	4.04
Men	24.7	57.7	12.6	4.0	0.9	4.01
Women	30.1	54.1	9.4	5.6	0.9	4.07
SAA:						
Blacks	14.8	56.7	15.2	12.3	1.1	3.72
Chicanos	17.0	60.9	17.0	5.0	0.0	3.90
Other SAA[1]	10.1	58.2	18.6	10.2	3.0	3.62
Non-SAA:						
Asians	27.9	55.9	13.1	3.1	0.0	4.09
Other Non-SAA[2]	30.1	55.3	9.3	4.4	0.9	4.09
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	19.6	65.4	10.5	3.8	0.7	3.99
Sophomores	35.4	49.6	10.1	4.7	0.2	4.15
Juniors	24.3	55.6	13.8	6.3	0.0	3.98
Seniors	29.2	55.5	8.9	4.1	2.3	4.05
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	24.3	57.3	12.8	4.3	1.3	3.99
Ag. & Env. Science	33.8	51.8	7.9	6.3	0.2	4.13
Engineering	27.0	58.9	9.6	3.8	0.6	4.08
National Norms	22.4	54.1	14.6	7.7	1.2	3.89

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.8% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-2

INSTRUCTION IN MAJOR FIELD

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	25.3%	50.6%	14.6%	8.5%	1.1%	3.90
Men	19.0	55.8	14.9	8.8	1.5	3.82
Women	31.4	45.6	14.2	8.2	0.7	3.99
Graduate/Professional	23.5	47.7	14.7	11.1	2.9	3.78
Undergraduates:						
All	25.9	51.6	14.5	7.5	0.4	3.95
Men	19.0	58.8	12.8	8.6	0.9	3.86
Women	32.2	45.1	16.1	6.6	0.0	4.03
SAA:						
Blacks	15.1	57.4	21.6	4.6	1.4	3.80
Chicanos	15.0	56.5	26.2	2.3	0.0	3.84
Other SAA[1]	10.8	50.6	24.2	13.5	1.0	3.57
Non-SAA:						
Asians	18.0	59.0	15.7	7.4	0.0	3.88
Other Non-SAA[2]	30.0	49.5	12.5	7.5	0.4	4.01
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	19.4	52.7	25.2	2.7	0.0	3.89
Sophomores	33.0	47.0	11.6	8.4	0.0	4.05
Juniors	18.6	60.6	11.3	9.6	0.0	3.88
Seniors	31.2	45.7	14.3	7.5	1.3	3.98
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	29.2	48.9	15.7	5.7	0.5	4.01
Ag. & Env. Science	25.3	52.6	10.7	11.2	0.2	3.92
Engineering	12.3	61.6	18.6	7.1	0.4	3.78
National Norms	22.1	50.7	18.0	7.8	1.4	3.84

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.9% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-3

FLEXIBILITY TO DESIGN OWN PROGRAM

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	20.2%	40.1%	26.9%	11.0%	1.9%	3.66
Men	23.2	37.5	25.4	11.1	2.8	3.67
Women	17.4	42.5	28.3	10.8	1.0	3.64
Graduate/Professional	20.9	39.5	25.1	12.2	2.3	3.65
Undergraduates:						
All	19.9	40.2	27.5	10.6	1.7	3.66
Men	23.4	36.9	25.1	12.1	2.5	3.67
Women	16.8	43.3	29.6	9.2	1.1	3.65
SAA:						
Blacks	20.0	41.2	20.6	15.7	2.6	3.60
Chicanos	15.3	46.8	24.0	11.2	2.6	3.61
Other SAA[1]	12.2	41.7	34.0	8.5	3.6	3.50
Non-SAA:						
Asians	15.9	39.4	38.0	3.6	3.1	3.61
Other Non-SAA[2]	21.8	40.0	24.9	12.2	1.1	3.69
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	23.7	42.1	28.1	5.6	0.5	3.83
Sophomores	21.6	42.9	25.8	9.1	0.6	3.76
Juniors	13.9	36.2	32.0	17.6	0.3	3.46
Seniors	22.0	40.8	24.1	8.3	4.8	3.67
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	20.3	38.3	28.7	10.5	2.2	3.64
Ag. & Env. Science	22.3	48.7	23.3	5.7	0.0	3.88
Engineering	12.0	26.8	32.9	24.3	4.0	3.18
National Norms	16.0	41.0	26.8	12.8	3.3	3.54

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *83.5% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-4

VARIETY OF COURSES OFFERED

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	32.0%	49.9%	11.3%	6.5%	0.4%	4.07
Men	28.2	52.3	11.5	7.5	0.5	4.00
Women	35.7	47.7	11.1	5.2	0.3	4.13
Graduate/Professional	26.6	43.1	17.9	11.4	1.0	3.83
Undergraduates:						
All	33.8	52.1	9.0	4.9	0.2	4.15
Men	29.7	55.7	8.5	6.0	0.2	4.09
Women	37.5	48.9	9.6	3.9	0.2	4.20
SAA:						
Blacks	32.5	37.5	16.8	9.9	3.2	3.86
Chicanos	38.3	45.6	12.3	2.6	1.2	4.17
Other SAA[1]	26.5	57.4	9.7	6.4	0.0	4.04
Non-SAA:						
Asians	32.4	51.3	12.1	4.2	0.0	4.12
Other Non-SAA[2]	34.7	53.0	7.6	4.7	0.0	4.18
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	38.9	45.4	11.5	3.7	0.4	4.19
Sophomores	45.0	45.2	5.9	4.0	0.0	4.31
Juniors	26.3	61.6	8.9	3.2	0.0	4.11
Seniors	30.1	51.9	10.0	7.7	0.3	4.04
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	32.9	50.0	11.8	5.1	0.2	4.10
Ag. & Env. Science	38.3	53.9	4.1	3.8	0.0	4.27
Engineering	27.3	57.5	8.3	6.4	0.4	4.05
National Norms	28.0	51.0	13.1	6.6	1.3	3.98

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *98.0% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-5

AVAILABILITY OF COURSES WANTED AT TIMES PREFERRED

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	10.1%	41.2%	23.6%	21.1%	4.0%	3.33
Men	6.9	38.2	28.2	22.0	4.8	3.20
Women	13.3	44.3	19.1	20.1	3.2	3.45
Graduate/Professional	12.1	48.2	19.5	16.9	3.3	3.49
Undergraduates:						
All	9.5	39.1	24.9	22.4	4.2	3.27
Men	7.0	33.5	32.3	22.1	5.0	3.15
Women	11.8	44.2	18.1	22.6	3.4	3.38
SAA:						
Blacks	7.3	48.9	23.7	16.9	3.2	3.40
Chicanos	8.5	51.1	12.6	22.7	5.0	3.35
Other SAA[1]	13.8	38.3	18.1	25.7	4.1	3.32
Non-SAA:						
Asians	5.1	46.1	22.2	23.7	2.9	3.27
Other Non-SAA[2]	10.4	36.3	26.8	22.1	4.5	3.26
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	6.0	49.6	23.8	15.1	5.6	3.35
Sophomores	10.1	29.0	29.7	28.6	2.6	3.15
Juniors	7.8	36.4	22.9	30.7	2.1	3.17
Seniors	12.8	42.5	24.0	14.4	6.3	3.41
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	13.3	36.9	26.0	21.0	2.7	3.37
Ag. & Env. Science	5.3	45.1	19.8	23.6	6.2	3.20
Engineering	2.0	34.4	32.0	25.6	6.0	3.01
National Norms	6.2	34.7	19.6	27.4	12.1	2.95

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.4% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-6

CLASS SIZE RELATIVE TO THE TYPE OF COURSE

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	15.2%	52.1%	20.8%	8.7%	3.3%	3.67
Men	14.6	50.7	21.9	9.2	3.7	3.63
Women	15.8	53.2	19.7	8.3	3.0	3.70
Graduate/Professional	25.3	49.5	18.3	5.5	1.4	3.92
Undergraduates:						
All	11.8	52.9	21.6	9.7	4.0	3.59
Men	10.4	51.2	23.1	11.0	4.3	3.52
Women	13.1	54.4	20.2	8.6	3.7	3.65
SAA:						
Blacks	19.6	48.7	23.0	7.8	1.0	3.78
Chicanos	13.9	48.3	23.9	9.1	4.8	3.57
Other SAA[1]	6.6	42.9	29.7	16.2	4.7	3.31
Non-SAA:						
Asians	17.1	53.8	19.4	8.5	1.3	3.77
Other Non-SAA[2]	10.5	54.1	21.2	9.6	4.7	3.56
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	12.4	52.4	25.5	5.9	3.8	3.64
Sophomores	15.0	53.2	17.3	11.8	2.7	3.66
Juniors	6.8	53.5	24.3	11.6	3.7	3.48
Seniors	14.1	52.4	19.6	8.7	5.2	3.61
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	13.7	51.4	21.2	9.3	4.4	3.61
Ag. & Env. Science	7.7	59.6	18.7	9.2	4.8	3.56
Engineering	13.3	43.4	30.5	12.8	0.0	3.57
National Norms	20.5	53.5	15.3	8.8	1.8	3.82

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *97.9% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-7

OUT-OF-CLASS AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTORS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	20.5%	54.1%	19.2%	5.4%	0.8%	3.88
Men	18.3	53.1	21.3	6.4	0.9	3.82
Women	22.6	55.2	17.3	4.3	0.6	3.95
Graduate/Professional	29.2	47.9	17.0	5.6	0.3	4.00
Undergraduates:						
All	17.4	56.4	20.0	5.3	0.9	3.84
Men	15.7	54.4	22.3	6.6	1.0	3.77
Women	19.0	58.2	17.9	4.1	0.8	3.90
SAA:						
Blacks	24.8	46.2	26.7	1.0	1.3	3.92
Chicanos	18.8	50.4	21.1	7.7	2.0	3.76
Other SAA[1]	13.7	47.2	29.5	7.7	1.9	3.63
Non-SAA:						
Asians	21.2	52.1	24.9	1.8	0.0	3.93
Other Non-SAA[2]	16.3	59.1	17.6	6.1	1.0	3.84
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	14.7	54.6	25.1	4.9	0.6	3.78
Sophomores	19.0	56.4	23.7	0.6	0.3	3.93
Juniors	14.0	57.1	20.4	8.4	0.0	3.77
Seniors	21.0	56.6	14.0	6.0	2.3	3.88
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	17.0	57.0	19.5	5.9	0.7	3.84
Ag. & Env. Science	18.1	57.0	17.6	5.8	1.6	3.84
Engineering	17.7	52.1	28.3	1.4	0.4	3.85
National Norms	18.4	49.7	22.5	7.8	1.6	3.75

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *97.9% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-8

ATTITUDE OF FACULTY TOWARD STUDENTS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	18.3%	55.6%	17.3%	6.8%	2.0%	3.81
Men	16.7	55.7	18.8	6.3	2.4	3.78
Women	19.8	55.5	15.8	7.2	1.7	3.85
Graduate/Professional	22.0	49.2	16.7	9.5	2.6	3.78
Undergraduates:						
All	17.0	57.8	17.4	5.9	1.8	3.82
Men	15.6	56.9	20.0	5.1	2.4	3.78
Women	18.3	58.7	15.1	6.6	1.3	3.86
SAA:						
Blacks	7.3	59.2	22.3	9.9	1.3	3.61
Chicanos	14.2	56.7	23.1	5.0	1.0	3.78
Other SAA[1]	7.1	55.7	25.2	9.1	2.9	3.55
Non-SAA:						
Asians	15.7	60.8	21.9	1.6	0.0	3.91
Other Non-SAA[2]	18.9	57.3	15.1	6.4	2.2	3.84
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	11.3	61.0	22.1	2.5	3.1	3.75
Sophomores	26.2	55.5	11.7	6.4	0.2	4.01
Juniors	10.6	60.2	22.4	5.5	1.3	3.73
Seniors	19.9	55.4	14.0	7.9	2.7	3.82
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	17.2	55.3	21.1	5.6	0.8	3.83
Ag. & Env. Science	19.1	61.6	6.8	8.2	4.3	3.83
Engineering	10.7	60.5	27.1	1.3	0.4	3.80
National Norms	20.8	50.1	20.0	7.4	1.7	3.81

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *98.7% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-9

TESTING/GRADING SYSTEM

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	4.7%	61.7%	18.9%	12.2%	2.5%	3.54
Men	4.9	59.4	19.7	12.7	3.3	3.50
Women	4.5	64.0	18.0	11.8	1.7	3.58
Graduate/Professional	6.9	53.1	23.1	14.2	2.6	3.48
Undergraduates:						
All	3.9	64.7	17.4	11.5	2.4	3.56
Men	4.3	61.2	17.9	13.2	3.3	3.50
Women	3.5	67.8	17.0	10.0	1.6	3.62
SAA:						
Blacks	3.0	49.9	32.1	12.6	2.5	3.38
Chicanos	2.3	65.2	23.9	5.4	3.1	3.58
Other SAA[1]	3.8	56.4	26.0	13.8	0.0	3.50
Non-SAA:						
Asians	5.2	71.4	18.8	4.6	0.0	3.77
Other Non-SAA[2]	3.8	64.6	15.2	13.2	3.1	3.53
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	2.5	73.8	16.3	6.1	1.2	3.70
Sophomores	2.6	73.3	15.3	6.2	2.5	3.67
Juniors	6.3	60.4	18.4	13.4	1.6	3.56
Seniors	3.4	57.3	18.8	16.8	3.8	3.40
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	3.4	63.3	18.6	11.7	3.0	3.52
Ag. & Env. Science	4.6	65.0	16.7	11.4	2.3	3.58
Engineering	4.7	70.2	14.1	11.0	0.0	3.69
National Norms	7.1	61.2	21.4	8.8	1.7	3.63

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *99.3% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-10

ACADEMIC PROBATION AND SUSPENSION POLICIES

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	5.5%	45.5%	41.8%	5.0%	2.2%	3.47
Men	5.2	43.7	42.0	5.6	3.5	3.42
Women	5.8	47.3	41.5	4.4	0.9	3.53
Graduate/Professional	4.3	34.6	50.8	8.1	2.2	3.31
Undergraduates:						
All	5.9	48.5	39.3	4.1	2.2	3.52
Men	5.9	46.5	39.8	4.5	3.3	3.47
Women	5.8	50.4	38.8	3.8	1.2	3.56
SAA:						
Blacks	10.3	41.1	38.3	8.4	2.0	3.49
Chicanos	6.8	51.9	37.2	2.8	1.3	3.60
Other SAA[1]	7.9	42.6	41.1	5.9	2.6	3.47
Non-SAA:						
Asians	11.3	63.2	25.5	0.0	0.0	3.86
Other Non-SAA[2]	3.9	45.6	42.9	4.8	2.8	3.43
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	8.2	44.0	42.3	0.9	4.7	3.50
Sophomores	1.9	50.3	41.3	3.1	3.5	3.44
Juniors	7.8	50.0	38.4	3.6	0.2	3.62
Seniors	5.2	48.8	36.9	7.4	1.7	3.48
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	6.5	42.9	44.4	3.9	2.3	3.47
Ag. & Env. Science	1.6	59.5	30.6	5.8	2.5	3.52
Engineering	14.4	44.8	39.3	0.9	0.6	3.71
National Norms	5.9	39.9	45.7	6.1	2.4	3.41

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *70.7% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-11

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS CHEATING?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not A Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean
Total Group	25.2%	44.4%	22.0%	8.4%	2.14
Men	31.2	45.3	15.6	7.9	2.00
Women	19.2	43.5	28.3	9.0	2.27
Graduate/Professional	29.3	37.1	23.3	10.2	2.14
Undergraduates:					
All	23.8	46.8	21.6	7.8	2.13
Men	29.7	49.0	13.8	7.6	1.99
Women	18.6	44.8	28.6	8.0	2.26
SAA:					
Blacks	27.2	46.9	16.8	9.1	2.08
Chicanos	28.5	44.7	17.3	9.4	2.08
Other SAA[1]	29.1	51.1	14.3	5.4	1.96
Non-SAA:					
Asians	25.4	46.5	20.4	7.6	2.10
Other Non-SAA[2]	22.5	46.6	23.0	7.9	2.16
Class Levels:					
Freshmen	32.9	47.8	18.5	0.9	1.87
Sophomores	27.5	48.0	21.6	2.9	2.00
Juniors	16.4	51.7	23.7	8.3	2.24
Seniors	23.1	40.7	21.4	14.8	2.28
Colleges:					
Letters & Science	20.3	50.6	21.1	7.9	2.17
Ag. & Env. Science	32.6	36.8	23.8	6.8	2.05
Engineering	18.2	53.6	18.5	9.7	2.20

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*

[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.4% of the respondents answered the question about cheating.*

TABLE A-12

CLASSROOM FACILITIES

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	7.6%	64.6%	17.5%	9.0%	1.4%	3.68
Men	7.8	65.3	17.9	7.1	2.0	3.70
Women	7.4	64.1	17.0	10.6	0.8	3.67
Graduate/Professional	9.6	57.8	17.5	13.5	1.7	3.60
Undergraduates:						
All	6.9	66.9	17.5	7.4	1.3	3.71
Men	6.4	68.4	18.4	4.7	2.0	3.72
Women	7.3	65.5	16.7	9.8	0.7	3.69
SAA:						
Blacks	16.9	53.1	16.8	13.1	0.0	3.74
Chicanos	7.4	68.7	16.7	7.2	0.0	3.76
Other SAA[1]	5.3	70.3	16.5	7.1	0.7	3.72
Non-SAA:						
Asians	10.3	64.8	17.8	5.8	1.3	3.77
Other Non-SAA[2]	5.6	67.9	17.6	7.5	1.5	3.69
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	7.6	69.0	17.8	5.4	0.2	3.78
Sophomores	7.2	78.6	8.5	5.6	0.0	3.87
Juniors	9.0	58.8	21.9	9.3	1.1	3.65
Seniors	4.2	65.3	19.4	8.0	3.1	3.59
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	8.1	64.4	19.9	7.5	0.0	3.73
Ag. & Env. Science	0.9	74.9	14.4	6.1	3.7	3.63
Engineering	15.8	59.2	13.5	9.8	1.8	3.77
National Norms	9.4	64.1	16.9	8.5	1.1	3.72

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *98.9% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-13

LABORATORY FACILITIES

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	12.3%	55.8%	21.3%	8.6%	2.1%	3.68
Men	13.0	53.9	20.5	8.7	3.7	3.64
Women	11.5	57.7	22.1	8.3	0.4	3.72
Graduate/Professional	16.0	52.0	16.8	12.0	3.2	3.66
Undergraduates:						
All	11.0	57.1	22.8	7.5	1.7	3.68
Men	11.3	57.4	21.5	6.4	3.4	3.67
Women	10.7	56.7	24.0	8.5	0.0	3.70
SAA:						
Blacks	19.5	48.7	22.2	9.6	0.0	3.78
Chicanos	21.9	48.8	19.4	9.8	0.0	3.83
Other SAA[1]	9.0	65.6	18.7	5.4	1.3	3.76
Non-SAA:						
Asians	11.7	72.1	16.2	0.0	0.0	3.96
Other Non-SAA[2]	10.0	53.0	25.2	9.4	2.4	3.59
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	15.6	56.9	22.8	2.7	2.0	3.82
Sophomores	11.2	63.7	18.4	6.6	0.0	3.80
Juniors	10.2	51.7	26.3	9.9	1.9	3.58
Seniors	9.0	57.3	22.7	8.5	2.5	3.62
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	11.9	50.1	29.1	6.5	2.4	3.63
Ag. & Env. Science	7.6	66.4	15.2	9.5	1.3	3.70
Engineering	15.9	60.4	17.4	6.2	0.0	3.86
National Norms	10.2	55.0	24.9	8.0	1.9	3.64

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *83.4% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-14

STUDY AREAS

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	11.7%	49.7%	18.0%	17.4%	3.1%	3.50
Men	10.5	52.4	18.8	15.1	3.3	3.52
Women	12.9	47.4	17.2	19.6	2.9	3.48
Graduate/Professional	11.0	40.1	19.2	23.3	6.5	3.26
Undergraduates:						
All	12.0	53.0	17.6	15.5	1.9	3.58
Men	9.8	57.8	18.9	11.9	1.6	3.62
Women	13.9	48.7	16.4	18.7	2.2	3.54
SAA:						
Blacks	24.7	49.3	15.0	8.7	2.3	3.85
Chicanos	20.5	52.2	13.6	11.5	2.2	3.77
Other SAA[1]	14.3	45.4	24.1	14.1	2.1	3.56
Non-SAA:						
Asians	3.1	60.0	17.5	18.1	1.3	3.45
Other Non-SAA[2]	12.7	52.2	17.5	15.6	2.0	3.58
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	21.0	58.4	13.0	7.0	0.6	3.92
Sophomores	18.9	55.3	14.9	10.9	0.0	3.82
Juniors	5.4	56.4	18.8	19.2	0.1	3.48
Seniors	8.3	45.0	21.0	20.0	5.6	3.30
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	13.1	50.4	16.0	17.5	3.0	3.53
Ag. & Env. Science	8.9	56.2	20.0	14.5	0.4	3.59
Engineering	14.3	57.3	19.2	8.5	0.8	3.76
National Norms	13.2	53.7	17.1	13.3	2.7	3.61

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *97.6% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-15

LIBRARY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Very Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	34.8%	48.4%	8.3%	7.4%	1.1%	4.08	97.7%
Men	33.7	51.5	7.9	5.1	1.9	4.10	97.5
Women	35.9	45.6	8.6	9.6	0.3	4.07	97.8
Graduate/Professional	36.0	46.7	7.6	6.2	3.5	4.06	97.3
Undergraduates:							
All	34.5	48.9	8.5	7.8	0.3	4.09	97.8
Men	35.1	52.9	7.3	4.0	0.6	4.18	97.6
Women	33.9	45.3	9.6	11.2	0.0	4.02	98.0
SAA:							
Blacks	33.5	53.1	8.7	4.7	0.0	4.15	96.6
Chicanos	43.0	42.6	11.1	3.3	0.0	4.25	98.8
Other SAA[1]	30.6	55.9	10.6	3.0	0.0	4.14	99.1
Non-SAA:							
Asians	34.9	52.9	10.8	1.3	0.0	4.21	100.0
Other Non-SAA[2]	34.3	47.5	7.7	10.2	0.4	4.05	97.2
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	38.8	43.6	9.6	7.9	0.0	4.13	96.5
Sophomores	50.6	41.3	2.9	5.2	0.0	4.37	96.3
Juniors	28.5	53.6	11.5	6.4	0.0	4.04	97.3
Seniors	26.6	52.7	9.1	10.7	0.9	3.93	100.0
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	31.1	49.7	7.9	10.9	0.5	4.00	98.7
Ag. & Env. Science	39.1	44.3	11.6	5.0	0.0	4.18	96.8
Engineering	39.1	56.9	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.35	95.8
National Norms	29.2	49.8	10.8	7.8	2.3	3.96	93.5

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.2% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-16

COMPUTER SERVICES

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Very Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	20.4%	59.2%	11.4%	8.1%	0.9%	3.90	53.9%
Men	23.1	54.1	12.4	9.4	1.0	3.89	64.2
Women	17.0	66.3	10.0	6.0	0.8	3.93	44.1
Graduate/Professional	17.4	54.2	15.8	11.1	1.6	3.75	64.2
Undergraduates:							
All	21.8	61.4	9.4	6.8	0.6	3.97	50.4
Men	25.5	54.6	10.0	8.8	1.0	3.95	61.0
Women	16.9	70.4	8.6	4.1	0.0	4.00	41.0
SAA:							
Blacks	35.9	50.8	10.8	0.0	2.6	4.17	52.4
Chicanos	22.2	45.8	17.2	11.3	3.5	3.72	45.4
Other SAA[1]	24.6	51.8	10.7	6.0	6.8	3.81	48.5
Non-SAA:							
Asians	32.8	62.7	2.2	2.2	0.0	4.26	59.6
Other Non-SAA[2]	17.4	63.2	11.0	8.4	0.0	3.90	48.6
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	24.7	68.8	1.1	4.5	0.9	4.12	42.3
Sophomores	40.2	49.9	2.4	7.5	0.0	4.23	42.7
Juniors	18.6	66.9	5.7	8.0	0.7	3.95	59.1
Seniors	14.2	58.0	21.0	6.2	0.7	3.79	52.5
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	22.2	59.6	12.7	5.3	0.2	3.98	41.5
Ag. & Env. Science	22.2	62.7	8.3	6.3	0.5	4.00	49.3
Engineering	20.6	63.4	4.2	10.4	1.5	3.91	95.4
National Norms	15.4	50.2	18.1	12.7	3.6	3.61	46.8

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *52.3% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-17

COLLEGE-SPONSORED TUTORIAL SERVICES

Level of Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied 5	Very Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	33.8%	47.6%	11.9%	4.7%	2.0%	4.06	23.2%
Men	29.3	51.6	11.1	3.9	4.1	3.98	19.7
Women	37.1	44.6	12.5	5.3	0.5	4.13	26.7
Graduate/Professional	50.0	42.3	3.8	3.8	0.0	4.38	8.7
Undergraduates:							
All	32.0	48.1	12.8	4.8	2.2	4.03	28.2
Men	25.5	54.3	12.3	3.3	4.6	3.93	24.5
Women	36.8	43.7	13.2	5.9	0.5	4.10	31.6
SAA:							
Blacks	29.8	51.0	11.5	6.5	1.2	4.02	84.9
Chicanos	42.5	40.2	13.5	1.9	1.9	4.20	59.5
Other SAA[1]	27.6	49.1	13.4	8.2	1.7	3.93	57.4
Non-SAA:							
Asians	29.9	41.1	22.0	7.0	0.0	3.94	40.6
Other Non-SAA[2]	33.3	52.4	7.7	2.6	3.9	4.08	18.0
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	29.2	43.3	26.3	1.3	0.0	4.00	37.1
Sophomores	39.2	50.4	5.1	4.6	0.6	4.23	32.8
Juniors	24.1	50.7	11.3	6.2	7.6	3.78	22.8
Seniors	35.4	48.1	9.0	6.8	0.7	4.11	25.1
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	34.5	44.6	15.0	5.3	0.6	4.07	28.3
Ag. & Env. Science	24.7	55.4	7.5	5.5	6.9	3.85	26.5
Engineering	35.5	49.1	14.1	1.3	0.0	4.19	32.4
National Norms	21.0	43.8	18.5	12.6	4.0	3.65	16.6

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *22.3% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-18

EXTENT UC DAVIS CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR INTELLECTUAL GROWTH

	Size of Contribution					
	None 1	Small 2	Moderate 3	Large 4	Very Large 5	Mean
Total Group	1.6%	4.6%	27.4%	46.2%	20.1%	2.78
Men	1.8	6.3	27.8	45.1	18.9	2.73
Women	1.5	3.1	27.2	47.0	21.2	2.83
Graduate/Professional	2.7	8.8	27.2	42.9	18.4	2.65
Undergraduates:						
All	1.3	3.2	27.5	47.4	20.6	2.83
Men	1.2	4.7	27.1	47.0	20.0	2.80
Women	1.3	1.8	27.9	47.7	21.2	2.86
SAA:						
Blacks	0.0	9.4	34.6	41.1	15.0	2.62
Chicanos	1.1	1.6	31.9	53.8	11.7	2.73
Other SAA[1]	1.0	2.1	29.0	51.6	16.3	2.80
Non-SAA:						
Asians	1.8	2.8	44.0	36.7	14.7	2.60
Other Non-SAA[2]	1.3	3.1	22.9	49.5	23.2	2.90
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	3.2	7.5	42.2	43.0	4.2	2.37
Sophomores	0.0	3.0	22.8	52.5	21.6	2.93
Juniors	1.4	2.1	28.4	52.0	16.2	2.80
Seniors	1.0	1.9	21.5	41.9	33.7	3.05
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	1.2	3.3	30.2	46.2	19.2	2.79
Ag. & Env. Science	2.0	3.4	26.9	45.3	22.3	2.83
Engineering	0.0	2.4	16.9	57.6	23.0	3.01

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.7% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-19

EXTENT UC DAVIS CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR WRITING ABILITY

	Size of Contribution					
	None 1	Small 2	Moderate 3	Large 4	Very Large 5	Mean
Total Group	10.0%	21.6%	33.5%	28.2%	6.8%	2.00
Men	11.4	18.8	32.6	29.1	8.1	2.04
Women	8.7	24.4	34.1	27.3	5.5	1.97
Graduate/Professional	21.1	25.9	27.2	19.7	6.1	1.64
Undergraduates:						
All	6.2	20.2	35.6	31.0	7.0	2.12
Men	8.8	16.6	33.9	32.3	8.4	2.15
Women	3.8	23.4	37.2	29.9	5.7	2.10
SAA:						
Blacks	2.3	17.9	32.8	35.4	11.6	2.36
Chicanos	1.2	22.2	42.5	27.8	6.4	2.16
Other SAA[1]	6.5	18.3	35.6	28.0	11.6	2.20
Non-SAA:						
Asians	3.6	16.3	29.8	46.9	3.4	2.30
Other Non-SAA[2]	7.3	21.2	36.8	27.5	7.2	2.06
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	6.5	25.2	19.3	44.9	4.1	2.15
Sophomores	3.5	15.9	45.5	32.0	3.1	2.15
Juniors	10.2	21.8	35.4	28.5	4.2	1.95
Seniors	4.2	18.7	38.3	24.8	14.0	2.26
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	5.3	19.5	35.8	30.4	8.9	2.18
Ag. & Env. Science	6.3	18.6	37.7	32.4	5.0	2.11
Engineering	9.9	26.7	29.7	30.7	3.0	1.90

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.6% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-20

PREPARATION RECEIVED FOR FUTURE OCCUPATION

	Level of Preparation					
	None 1	Small 2	Moderate 3	Large 4	Very Large 5	Mean
Total Group	17.3%	43.8%	28.3%	7.9%	2.7%	3.65
Men	17.1	43.9	30.1	6.3	2.6	3.67
Women	17.6	43.7	26.4	9.4	2.9	3.64
Graduate/Professional	26.8	43.5	20.7	6.4	2.7	3.85
Undergraduates:						
All	13.9	43.9	31.0	8.4	2.8	3.58
Men	12.2	43.9	33.8	7.6	2.6	3.55
Women	15.4	43.9	28.5	9.2	2.9	3.60
SAA:						
Blacks	7.8	47.0	30.1	14.0	1.1	3.46
Chicanos	14.7	56.9	17.4	9.7	1.2	3.74
Other SAA[1]	6.5	38.0	36.0	12.7	6.7	3.25
Non-SAA:						
Asians	10.3	55.9	24.8	7.5	1.6	3.66
Other Non-SAA[2]	15.5	41.0	32.7	7.9	2.9	3.58
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	10.1	36.7	40.8	7.8	4.5	3.40
Sophomores	20.5	49.0	21.9	8.3	0.2	3.81
Juniors	10.6	49.1	30.0	8.9	1.3	3.59
Seniors	14.3	39.1	33.3	8.4	4.9	3.49
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	14.4	38.3	35.3	9.3	2.7	3.52
Ag. & Env. Science	13.5	48.3	27.4	6.8	4.1	3.60
Engineering	12.4	58.0	21.2	8.4	0.0	3.74
National Norms	16.4	44.1	27.2	9.4	2.8	3.62

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *93.6% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-21

SATISFACTION WITH UC DAVIS IN GENERAL

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean
Total Group	32.3%	55.6%	9.0%	2.0%	1.0%	4.16
Men	27.9	59.3	10.1	1.2	1.4	4.11
Women	36.6	52.1	8.0	2.7	0.7	4.21
Graduate/Professional	19.9	61.1	14.7	3.6	0.7	3.96
Undergraduates:						
All	36.6	53.7	7.0	1.5	1.2	4.23
Men	31.6	58.0	8.0	0.8	1.7	4.17
Women	41.1	49.8	6.2	2.2	0.7	4.28
SAA:						
Blacks	9.8	70.7	14.4	4.1	1.0	3.84
Chicanos	43.7	48.0	5.7	2.6	0.0	4.33
Other SAA[1]	31.4	57.9	5.5	4.2	0.9	4.15
Non-SAA:						
Asians	27.1	67.3	4.3	0.0	1.3	4.19
Other Non-SAA[2]	40.5	49.4	7.5	1.4	1.2	4.26
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	43.6	45.4	7.1	0.6	3.4	4.25
Sophomores	39.9	55.3	4.5	0.4	0.0	4.35
Juniors	31.4	58.6	7.0	2.9	0.0	4.19
Seniors	35.3	52.7	8.8	1.4	1.8	4.18
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	36.9	51.8	8.9	1.8	0.6	4.23
Ag. & Env. Science	36.6	53.8	5.5	1.4	2.8	4.20
Engineering	35.3	62.2	2.0	0.6	0.0	4.32
National Norms	23.7	58.9	11.9	4.4	1.2	3.99

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *99.2% of the respondents answered this question.*

TABLE A-22

STILL ATTEND UC DAVIS IF YOU COULD START ALL OVER AGAIN?

	Definitely Yes 5	Probably Yes 4	Not Sure 3	Definitely Not 2	Probably Not 1	Mean
Total Group	41.5%	36.2%	11.2%	8.5%	2.6%	4.06
Men	38.3	38.7	11.9	8.4	2.7	4.01
Women	44.7	33.9	10.6	8.3	2.5	4.10
Graduate/Professional	36.5	39.2	10.6	11.3	2.4	3.96
Undergraduates:						
All	43.2	35.2	11.4	7.5	2.7	4.09
Men	39.6	37.7	12.2	7.5	3.0	4.04
Women	46.4	32.9	10.7	7.5	2.4	4.13
SAA:						
Blacks	24.6	23.4	34.8	14.1	3.1	3.52
Chicanos	45.8	32.6	13.6	5.3	2.6	4.14
Other SAA[1]	38.7	33.7	13.9	8.5	5.2	3.92
Non-SAA:						
Asians	41.1	31.6	8.8	15.8	2.8	3.92
Other Non-SAA[2]	45.0	37.0	10.3	5.2	2.5	4.17
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	45.0	30.5	9.9	12.0	2.6	4.03
Sophomores	45.4	39.6	9.3	5.5	0.2	4.24
Juniors	35.6	40.5	18.0	4.2	1.7	4.04
Seniors	47.6	29.9	7.7	9.4	5.4	4.05
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	43.3	32.3	11.2	10.3	2.9	4.03
Ag. & Env. Science	43.7	38.1	9.8	5.3	3.1	4.14
Engineering	41.2	41.3	16.2	0.3	1.0	4.21

[1] *Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.*
[2] *Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.*

NOTE: *96.8% of the respondents answered this question.*